QUERIES & ANSWERS.

Which of the States of the Union Is the Oldest?

AGE OF VIRGINIA'S CAPITAL.

"Quam Fluctus Diversi" Again—A List of Some of Father Courtney's Scholars—Star-Route Contracts, Etc.

To the Editor of the Dispatch:

Is the sun closer to us in winter or summer? C. E. E.

The sun is nearest to us in winter.

To-Morrow "Is," &c.

A Gordonsville correspondent asks us whether it is right to say, "To-morrow is Monday," or "to-morrow will be Monday." Either is correct. In the New Testament "is" is used: "To-morrow is the great day of the feast."

Additions to Rented Property.

To the Editor of the Dispatch:

When additions are made by a tenant to rented property, cannot these additions be removed by tenant at expiration of lease if fastened with screws?

Fredericksburg. S. B. H.

As a rule no.

Mrs. Washington's Maiden Name.

To the Editor of the Dispatch:

Will you please inform me through your Query column of the maiden-name of Martha Custis Washington, and oblige?

A CONSTANT READER.

Mrs. Washington was the daughter of Colonel John Dandridge, a planter, in New Kent county.

What is Free Coinage?

To the Editor of the Dispach:

Will you kindly answer through the Dispatch the following question:

Does free coinage of silver mean that a man can take 56 cents' (a dollar's) worth of silver bullion to the United States Treasury for coinage and get back in exchange a silver dollar?

Yes.

Father Courtney's Scholars.

To the Editor of the Dispatch:

I herewith give you the names of some of Father Courtney's scholars: J. E. Phillips, William A. Phillips, J. A. Macaulay, Joseph B. McKenny, Charles H. Langford, D. H. Pyle, R. L. Tucker, Alexander Nelson Shell, Leonidas R. Shell, Alexander P. Foudree, Daniel Higgins, John R. Redford, Thomas Brannan, Frank Brannan, John G. Satterwhite, Edward F. Sneade, A. J. Wray, W. B. Clark, Sylvester Bernard, William Snellings.

D. H. P.

Cows Chewing Tobacco-Sticks.

To the Editor of the Dispatch:

Will you please inform me through your Query column why cows chew tobacco sticks? I have had a good many destroyed by them. W. S. D.

Cows are very fond of tobacco. They will chew and eat the stalks, and they love the chaff from the seed as well as wheat bran. The sticks in question, we presume, are old ones, and the flavor and aroma of tobacco is strong on them, and hence the cows chew them to get the tobacco flavor.

A Hero Sung.

To the Editor of the Dispatch:

The following sentence is attributed to Henry Ward Beecher: "We hear a hero sung, and the martial music that announces his coming is drowned in the shrieks of orphans." My friend and myself do not agree as to its being good English, our disagreement being on the use of the word "sung." Will you please give us your opinion and oblige.

A SUBSCRIBER.

Winston, N. C.

"We hear a hero's praises sung" is good English, and the sentence quoted by "A Subscriber" may also be good, especially as it seems to involve a case of poetic license, and is attributed to Henry Ward Beecher.

Richmond the Capital.

To the Editor of the Dispatch:

Please state in your next issue when Richmond became the capital of the State—that is, the year and month. Can't be found in the common-school histories. Please answer the above, and oblige. L. L. G.

Eastham, Va.

Richmond was made the capital by Act of Assembly, May session, 1779, to take effect "from and after the last day of April, which shall be in the year of our Lord one thousand seven hundred and eighty." On May 1, 1780, the General Assembly met there (in buildings used temporarily) for the first time. On October 27, 1788, both houses met for the first time "in the new Capitol, on Shockoe Hill"; but the Senate did not have a quorum until the next day (28th), when the General Assembly went into full operation in the new Capitol.

"Quam Fluctus Diversi," &c.

To the Editor of the Dispatch:

Please give a free translation of the motto of the Washington Literary Society of the University of Virginia, and state how it applies—viz., "Quam flucti diversi, quam mare conjuncti." D.

Post-Office, Earlysville, Va.

The motto of the Washington Literary Society is not "Quam flucti diversi; quam mare conjuncti," but "Quam fluctus diversi; quam mare conjuncti." Literally translated: "As the waves distinct; as the sea joined, or united"; or more freely "Distinct as the billows; one as the sea."

It is a translation into Latin of a line of the poet Montgomery's, and, of course, means, or was intended to mean, that, whilst the members of the society in their individual capacities were separate and distinct units, yet, in the common aims of the society, they were united as one mass.

The plural of fluctus is not "fluctus," nor "flucti," as our enquirer hath it.

Star-Route Contracts.

To the Editor of the Dispatch:

Will you please tell me through your Query column can any man get a contract from the government to carry the mail on a star route, and how are these contracts let? G. W. S.

We are informed that whenever the department desires to enter into contract for mail service on a star or steamboat route, after the issuance of the general advertisement for the contract section where the service is needed, advertisements are posted at the terminal offices of the route to be let, and also in the department building in Washington, for a period of ten days, inviting proposals for the service.

In all general mail lettings, which include all the star and steamboat routes to be let in the States and Territories embraced in the contract section, for the full contract term of four years, advertisements are issued in pamphlet form, one for each State and Territory, a copy of which is posted in every post-office in the State in which the routes to be let are located. The next general advertisement for Virginia will be issued next September.

In all cases contracts for the service are awarded to the lowest responsible bidder who tenders the required bond and security for the proper performance of the service.

"Descendants" of Sir Francis Drake.

To the Editor of the Dispatch:

I note in your last issue many descendants of Sir Francis Drake. There are many Drakes, but Sir Francis, the circumnavigator, left no descendants. His heir was his brother, Captain Thomas, as stated in the Genesis of the United States, page 881. X. X.

At All Druggists'.

To the Editor of the Dispatch:

In the following sentence, is it correct to use the apostrophe after the "s" or not?

"At all druggists', 25 cents, meaning that an article can be procured at any drugstore for 25 cents.

2. Explain why it is plural possessive.

READER.

1. Yes.

2. The apostrophe is necessary, because we mean to say "all druggists' stores, and the word stores is understood.

To make the matter clearer, possibly, suppose we substitute a singular noun for the plural one given. If we do not use the apostrophe, indicating the possessive case, we shall have "at any druggist," for example, or "at the druggist." We must use the possessive case, plural or singular, to indicate what we mean, which is "at all druggists' stores," "at any druggist's store," "at the druggist's store," though the word "stores," or "store," as the case may be, is only understood in each instance.

Disfranchised Confederates.

To the Editor of the Dispatch:

In the Free Lance (issue of 22d instant), a paper published at Fredericksburg, Va., appeared the following:

"To the Free Lance:

"Desultory reading of the last decade has impressed my memory with the idea that I have encountered promiscuously in print the statement that there is a statute law in one or more of the States of the Union denying to Confederate veterans the right of suffrage. If such is a fact, please give the desired information through the columns of the Free Lance, and also the name or names of such State or States.

"C. VETERAN.

"We think our correspondent is entirely mistaken, but if there is any such denial anywhere we are sure the Dispatch, of Richmond, would know it."

Now sir, for the information of "C. Veteran," and others, I would say that in the State of Nevada all unamnestied Confederates who bore arms against the United States are expressly denied the right of suffrage; while the State of Vermont, without qualification, absolutely prohibits all Confederates from voting.

The Dispatch is indeed to be congratulated that, even in satire, it is reckoned authority in all matters pertaining to the glorious, honored, and much-lamented Southern Confederacy.

G. E. T. LANE.

Port Hayward, Mathews county.

Sandal-Shoon and Scallop-Shell.

To the Editor of the Dispatch:

In Byrne's "Childe Haroide," last stanza, we find these words: "Sandal-shoon and scallop-shell." What do they mean, and how do they apply to his writing? TEACHER.

The scallop-shell was in medieval times the badge of a pilgrim. A certain kind of scallop occurs on the coast of Palestine, and the shell of this kind was worn by pilgrims as a mark that they had been to the Holy Land. Shoon is an archaic, or old-fashioned, plural of shoe, and the sandal is a kind of shoe which was formerly worn by pilgrims. "Childe Harold" is a sort of pilgrim—a man sated with the world, who roams from place to place to kill time and escape from himself—in fact, Lord Byron himself, who was only 22 when he began to write the poem, which was completed in seven years. In canto I., the "childe" visits Portugal and Spain (1809); in canto II., Turkey in Europe (1810); in canto III., Belgium and Switzerland (1816); and in canto IV., Venice, Rome, and Florence (1817). "Childe" is a title of honor, about equivalent to "lord," as Childe Waters, Childe Rolande, Childe Tristram, Childe Arthur, etc.

The First Negroes Brought to Virginia.

To the Editor of the Dispatch:

I take from a paper the following statement—viz.: That "A Dutch man-of-war, sailing up the James river, landed at Jamestown, Va., and offered for sale at auction twenty Africans. These were purchased and made slaves for life. This was the beginning of the negro problem. The twenty negroes landed at Jamestown in 1620 have increased to 8,000,000."

I do not doubt the first part of this statement; suppose it is history. Please answer in your Query column—are the 8,000,000 negroes who are now in the United States, all of them descendants of the twenty who landed at Jamestown in 1620? M. M'LAURINE.

Ballsville, Va.

It has been generally thought that the first negroes were brought to the English colony at Jamestown in 1619 (not 1620) by a Dutch man-of-war. This is doubtful; but we cannot go into the discussion now.

Negroes were brought here at that time (and probably before) by the English, and almost continuously from time to time thereafter by people of many nations, and to all parts of our country.

It is not certain; in fact, it is very doubtful, if many of the 8,000,000 negroes now in the United States descend from any of those landed in Virginia in 1619.

Pool-Selling and Book-Making.

To the Editor of the Dispatch:

Please explain in your Queries and Answers column the terms "pool-selling" and "book-making." J.

Berlin, Va.

In horse-racing, a pool is the combination of a number of persons, each staking a sum of money on the success of a horse in a race, the money to be divided among the sucessful betters, according to the amount put in by each. An auction-pool is a pool made up of bids for the privilege of naming the first, the second, and, sometimes, the third choice, and for the chance of the field. "Paris mutuels," sometimes incorrectly called "Paris mutuals," are a pool in which each better lays a fixed sum on the horse that he selects, and those who choose the winners divide the entire stake, less the percentage of the person who furnishes the pool-tickets. The phrase "paris mutuels" means literally "mutual bets."

To make a book is to lay bets (recorded in a pocket-book) against the success of every horse, so that the bookmaker wins on all the unsuccessful horses, and loses only on the winning horse or horses. "In betting there are two parties—one called 'layers,' as the bookmakers are termed, and the others 'backers,' in which class may be included owners of horses, as well as the public. The backer takes the odds which the bookmaker lays against a horse, the former speculating upon the success of the animal, the latter upon its defeat; and, taking the case of Cremorne, for the Derby of 1872, just before the race, the bookmaker would have laid 3 to 1, or, perhaps, £1,000 to £300 against him, by which transaction, if the horse won, as he did, the backer would win £1,000 for risking £300, and the bookmaker lose the £1,000 which he risked, to win the smaller sum. At first sight this may appear an act of very questionable policy on the part of the bookmaker, but, really, it is not so; because, so far from running greater risk than the backer, he runs less, inasmuch as it is his plan to lay the same amount (£1,000) against every horse in the race, and, as there can be but one winner, he would, in all probability, receive more than enough money from the many losers to pay the stated sum of £1,000, which, the chances are, he has laid against the one winner, whichever it is."—English Encyclopaedia.

The Battle of Sailors' Creek.

To the Editor of the Dispatch:

Will you kindly give me the following information through your "Query" column," or in the "Confederate column," of Sunday's paper: 1. What was the date of the battle of Sailor's Creek? 2. Was it not the last important battle of the civil war? 3. What forces were actually engaged on each side? 4. What were the casualties on each side in killed and wounded? 5. What was the actual number of Confederates captured? 6. Were any of the troops of General Ewell's Corps captured, in addition to Pickett's Division of Longstreet's Corps, or only General Ewell and his staff? 7. Is it not a fact that the defeat of the Confederates was chiefly the result of General Mahone's failure to connect closely with Pickett's right—thus permitting Sheridan's cavalry to make a flank attack in Pickett's rear?

If this seems too much like a "string of questions," you might answer them in condensed form, as I simply desire to get accurate information on the points named, and I thought it possible that this communication might draw forth a letter of reminiscences from some of the survivors of the troops engaged in this battle.

Amelia county. T. P. S.

1. The battle of Sailors' Creek, or Harper's Farm, or Deatonville, Va., was fought on the 6th of April, 1865.

2. It was one of the last important battles of the war, not the last important battle of the war.

3. Volumes XLVI., parts 1 and 3, of Records of the War, give all information obtainable about forces engaged.

4. The reports above mentioned give all information obtainable of casualties.

5. See the Records above mentioned.

6. See the Records above mentioned.

7. On this question the Dispatch declines to express an opinion—not having the time to make the necessary study of the evidence—but refers its correspondent to the official records.

When, and in What Order of Time, Did the North American Colonies Become States?

To the Editor of the Dispatch:

Under the "Query" head the Dispatch of February 4th, 1896, has the following questions, signed "F:"

1. Which of the thirteen original States may rightfully claim to be the oldest, and why?

2. What was the order in which the other twelve follow?

The answers given have caused a feeling of surprise and dissent in more than one mind heretofore occupied by studies on State rights. Some sentences from these answers read as follows: "Thus Virginia was the first, or one of the first to organize. As to the order of organization there may be differences of opinion; but all really became States at the same time by act of Congress."

Evidently these sentences were written under some vague impression that each of the original Colonies became a State by some process analogous to that by which a Territory may now become a State, and may be admitted to the Union "by act of Congress." But the ways are radically and essentially different. If the doctrine suggested in one of those sentences be true, and if each of the primitive thirteen Colonies became a State "by act of Congress," then the inevitable logical conclusion is that those northern writers of pretended history, who call the southern movements of 1860-'65 "The Great Rebellion," and who deny the right of secession, and who censure the southern people of that time as guilty of rebellion and treason have sound reasons for their opinions. But it is not true.

Not one of the primitive "thirteen" became a State by any act of the Congress. Each Colony became a sovereign State by the spontaneous act of her own people, when, for sufficient cause, and in the exercise of the sacred right of revolution, those people threw off the rule of Great Britian, and put a stop to all British governmental power over them, and exercised the right and power of governing themselves. From the time when this was done in each Colony, that Colony was a sovereign State.

The notion that the Congress had any power to make a Colony a State is contradicted by the very nature of the case, and the known historical facts relating thereto. This notion of the power of Congress is utterly unsound and deluding. It has been advocated in our day by the shallow German publicist, Von Holst, and by Professor Alexander Johnston, who incautiously adopts his views. They hold that those early American Congresses had proven practically unlimited, and might, if they had so chosen, have exercised a revolutionary absolution that would have annihilated the individual life of each Colony, and converted all into a great centralized sovereignty which would have ruled the people at its will.

This theory is utterly destitute of truth. The primitive congresses, from that of 1774 to that of 1777, when the "Articles of Confederation" were adopted, had no recognized governmental powers at all. All their acts and resolutions for raising money, organizing and equipping armies, and carrying on the war, were entirely dependent upon the voluntary submission and support of the people for the accomplishment of every measure recommended. That very Congress, which met in Philadelphia on the 10th day of May, 1775 (the same day that Ticonderoga was captured by Ethan Allen), was so entirely without governmental or coercive power that it could not raise money to pay its own necessary expenses, and was dependent on the liberality of the carpenters of the city for the use of the very hall in which it sat. This Congress was merely a voluntary assemblage, having neither executive, nor legislative, nor judicial powers. They had not a square foot of ground over which they could claim jurisdiction; they had no money and no power to raise money; they had not a civil officer, not a soldier enlisted, not one military officer subject to their commands. "They represented nothing more solid than the unformed opinion of an unformed people." And the Congress of 1776 was equally destitute of government power. Assuredly, they had no power to convert Colonies into States. And they did not claim to exercise any such power.

Several of the Colonies had become sovereign States prior to May, 1776. All that was essential to this end was that the people of the Colony should shake off the British yoke; put a stop to the exercise of all recognized British authority within their bounds, and take the exercise of government power into their own hands. We must carefully note the fact that, in order to become a State, it was not essentially necessary that a written State constitution should have been adopted. Several of the Colonies became States many years before they ever had a written constitution.

Under the light of these settled principles, and of authentic history, we are prepared in substance to answer the queries appearing in the Dispatch:

Of the thirteen Colonies, Massachusetts was the first that assumed the functions of a sovereign State.

In October, 1774, her General Assembly, after waiting in vain two days for the Governor (Gage) to appear, passed judgment on his unlawful proceedings, and resolved themselves into a "provincial congress," and adjourned to Concord. From that time the British rule was entirely thrown off, and every power of a "State" was exercised except within the British military lines. The Congress of Massachusetts appointed a committee of safety; mustered the militia and required a fourth of them to hold themselves ready to march at a minute's notice; provided for raising $90,000, and for ordnance, small arms, ammunition, and military stores. Those were certainly functions of a State; and yet Massachusetts never adopted a written State constitution until 1780!

Virginia came next in emerging from Colonial dependency to State sovereignty. On the 8th of June, 1775, the British Governor, Dunmore, fled from his palace, in Williamsburg, and, with his wife and his hated secretary, Foy, and some of his servants, took refuge on board the English frigate Fowey at Yorktown. From that time the British executive power ceased in Virginia, and open war existed between her and England's forces, naval and military. The House of Burgesses continued to sit until the 6th of May, 1776. On that day the few members in attendance dispersed to meet no more. Yet Virginia did not adopt the "Bill of Rights," written by George Mason, until June 12, 1776; nor adopt her State Constitution until June 29, 1776. She had been a sovereign State for nearly a year.

In August, 1775, South Carolina established a provincial congress, having all the powers of a State general assembly. And prior to July 4, 1776, she adopted a constitution, by which this statehood was fully avouched.

New Hampshire came next, having declared herself a State and erected a State government in December, 1775. Eggleston, in his "Household," United States, 194, says she was the first Colony that became a State; but this is an error.

In May, 1776, the people and the Congress had reached the conclusion that entire independence of any government control by Great Britain was their only safety. Accordingly the Congress passed a resolution recommending that each of the former Colonies which had not already done so should erect herself into a State. Observe how carefully the Congress disclaimed on their own part all power to make any Colony into a State!

But, their advice was heeded, and promptly complied with by Connecticut, Delaware, Maryland, New Jersey, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, and Virginia. Then for the first time the connection in a common Governor between Pennsylvania and Delaware was severed.

The above designation is alphabetical in order. Before the Fourth of July, 1776, all the Colonies had become States, in each case by the internal action of its own people. Congress did not make them States, nor did their written constitutions (when they adopted any) make them States. These constitutions only testified to the fact.

On this subject, the case of "Rhode Island and Providence Plantations" is specially instructive. Rhode Island became a State, and was recognized as a sovereign State by the Congress, and by the "Articles of Confederation" and by the treaty of peace with Great Britain. But Rhode Island was so pleased with the form of her chartered government obtained by John Clark in 1663 from King Charles II. that she did not abandon it. She never adopted a written constitution until 1842, and then amid the throes of a revolution led by Thomas Wilson Dorr.

No competent student of history now doubts that Dorr was right in his opposition to the effete charter of 1663. Though he was driven from the State by arms, and (having returned of his own accord) was arrested, tried, convicted of high treason, and sentenced to imprisonment for life; yet he was pardoned in 1847, and in 1853 the Legislature of his State restored his civil rights and ordered the record of his conviction to be expunged. And Dorr lived long enough to see Rhode Island adopt a constitution, in which was embodied every principle for which he had contended! Martyrs for truth are still found in this world.

In announcing the principles and reciting the facts appearing in this article, I have done nothing more than follow the safest lights of history. They have all been set forth, in their natural order and logical sequences in the "Students' United States," pages 359, 360, 516, 524, 529, with references to the authorities sustaining them. R. R. HOWISON.

Bradshaw, near Fredericksburg, February 5, 1896.

We have read Mr. Howison's article, and see no reason for changing the brief reply to the query mentioned—viz., "The thirteen original United States were so styled by the Congress on July 4, 1776, all becoming officially States at the same time. Virginia was regularly organized as a State on the next day—July 5, 1776. Thus, Virginia was the first, or one of the first, to organize. As to the order of organization, there may be differences of opinion, but all really became States at the same time, by act of Congress."

Virginia may be regarded as having been a revolting Colony, exercising the right of governing herself from (on or before) August 1, 1774; but in dealing with the matter of States other things must be considered. On July 4th the convention of Virginia "laid off the Colony into districts for choice of senators." On the same day the thirteen "United States" declared their independence by act of Congress, etc.

On the next day the Committee of Safety of the revolting Colony of Virginia ceased to exist, and Patrick Henry took the oath as the first Governor of the "State," and the first year of the Commonwealth of Virginia began on that day; but the government first assumed a regular form with the meeting of the first State Assembly, on October 7, 1776. And in the opinion of many these United States should be considered as revolting Colonies from the Mother Country until they had achieved their independence. For if they had failed in this, our forefathers would have been known in history as rebels—not as patriots—and Virginia would have been a revolting Colony and would not have became a de facto State.

Having achieved their independence from Great Britain, the States were then in position to state what they regarded as their rights from each other, and this they did do in the debates, etc., over the adoption and ratification of the Constitution. It is not the object of these replies to deal with differences of opinion: they only pretend to answer questions in the briefest possible way, without going into controversies, and although the reply was not as clearly written as it might have been, it seemed to us to answer.

Notice to Correspondents.

No notice will be taken of anonymous communications.

We cannot publish copyrighted songs and poems without the permission of the owner of the coypright.

This column is not an advertising medium. No query will receive attention the answer to which would necessitate the advertising of any person's business or wares.

Nor will any attention be given to long "strings" of questions. Every week numbers of correspondents ignore this rule of ours, and afterwards wonder why their queries are not answered.

Many queries are not answered because similar ones have been recently answered.

We cannot undertake to ascertain the value of old coins. For that information write to some dealer in them.

We cannot undertake to answer queries by mail; we can only answer them through this column.

Address "Query Editor, Dispatch Office, Richmond, Va."

We are frequently called upon to republish poems and songs, but we will not undertake to do so, except where the production called for has some historical or peculiar literary merit, and is not of easy access to the average reader.

N. B. We do not read unsigned letters.

Book Reviews.

HISTORY OF THE JEWS. By Professor H. Graetz; Volume V. From the Chmielnicki Persecution of the Jews in Poland (1648, C. E.) to the Present Time 1870, C. E.). Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America. 731 Pages. Price, $3.

This completes the translation of the Graetz History proper, though all who may be so fortunate as to own the work will be glad to learn that the publishers have decided to issue a supplemental volume, embracing "a portrait and memoirs" of the historian, a chronological analysis of Jewish history, a new and complete index of the five volumes, and a series of maps, illustrative of the history at different times." The periods of the four volumes preceding the present one are: Volume I., from the earliest period to the death of Simon the Maccabee (135, B. C. E.); Volume II., from the reign of Hyrcanus to the completion of the Babylonian Talmud (500 C. E.); Volume III., from the completion of the Babylonian Talmud to the banishment of the Jews from England (1290, C. E.); Volume IV., from the rise of the Kabbala (1270, C. E.) to the permanent settlement of the Marranos in Holland (1618, C. E.).

In the opening chapter of Volume V. we have the story of the Chmielnicki persecution, succinctly and graphically told, together with a fearless and in some respects scathing criticism of the Polish Talmudic School. To the students of the Talmud, in Poland, Graetz credits great scholarship, but, he says: "The disciples of this school looked down almost with contempt on Scripture in its simple grandeur, or, rather, it did not exist for them. How, indeed, could they have found time to occupy themselves with it? And what could they do with these children's stories, which did not admit the application of intellectual subtlety? They knew something of the Bible from the extracts read in the synagogues, and those occasionally quoted in the Talmud. The faculty for appreciating the sublimity of Biblical doctrines and characters, as well as simplicity and elevation in general, was denied them."

Professor Graetz shows how the Polish-Rabbnineal methods of study spread to the Talmudical schools of Germany, and then passes to the career of Manasseh ben Israel, and the settlement of the Jews in England. With Manasseh ben Israel, says the historian, began the Jewish struggle for civil equality. "He was the Riesser of the seventeenth century." In this connection we have a most interesting insight into the political and religious conditions existing at the time in England, and the Jewish and the Christian literature that the question of the admission of the Jews into that country inspired.

Chapter 3 goes back some years, and treats of "the skeptics," and from it, as an example of Graetz's methods of thought we quote the following:

"Judasim, then in its three-thousandth year, was like a rich kernel, covered and concealed by crusts, desposited one upon another, and by extraordinary matter, so that only very few could recognize its true character. The Sinaitic and prophetic kernel of thought had long been covered over with the three-fold layer of Sopheric, Mishnaitic, and Talmudical explanations and restrictions. Over these, in the course of centuries, new layers had been formed by the Gaonic, Spanish, French, German, and Polish schools, and these layers and strata were enclosed by an unsightly growth of fungus forms, the mouldy coating of the Kabbala, which, settling in the gaps and chinks, grew and ramified. All these new forms had already the authority of age in their favor, and were considered inviolable. People no longer asked what was taught in the fundamental Sinaitic law, or what was considered of importance by the prophets; they scarcely regarded what the Talmud decided to be essential or non-essential; the rabbinical writers alone, Joseph Karo and Moses Isserless, being the highest authorities, decided what was Judaism. Besides, there were superadditions from the Polish schools, and, lastly, the Kabbalistic dreams of Isaac Surga. The parasitic Kabbala choked the whole religious life of the Jews. Almost all rabbis and leaders of Jewish communities, whether in small Polish towns or in cultivated Amsterdam—the Chacham Isaac Ahoab de Fonseca, as well as Isaiah Hurwitz, the emigrant to Palestine—were ensnared by the Kabbala. Gaining influence in the fourteenth century, contemporaneously with the ban against science, it had made such giant strides since Isaac Surga's death, or, rather, committed such gigantic ravages, that nothing could keep it in check. Surga's wild notions of the origin, transmigration, and union of souls, of redemption, and wonder-working, after his death, attracted more and more adherents into his magic circle, clouding their minds and narrowing their sympathies."

In the two succeeding chapters we have as almost a logical sequence, a treatise on Spinoza and Sabbattai Zevi, then "Light and Shade," as embracing, "The Jews Under Mahometan Rule," "The Expulsion From Vienna," and "Milder Treatment Throughout Europe." Following these chapters is the "general demoralization of Judaism," at the end of the seventeenth century, and "The Age of Luzzatto, Ebeschutz, and Frank," and we are then brought to "The Mendelssohn Epoch."

Professor Graetz's treatment of this epoch is in many respects a volume in itself, and it holds the attention with a fascinating grasp. The keynote of his treatise is sounded when he says:

"The Jewish race has displayed miraculous phenomena not only in ancient days—the age of miracles—but also in this matter-of-fact epoch; a community which was an object of mockery, not merely to the malicious and ignorant, but almost more to benevolent and cultured men; despicable in its own eyes; admirable only by reason of its domestic virtues and ancient memories; both, however, disfigured beyond recognition by trivial observances; scourging itself with bitter irony; of which a representative member could justly remark, 'My nation has become so estranged from culture that the possibility of improvement is doubtful'—this community, nevertheless, raised itself from the dust. It revived itself with marvellous rapidity, from its abjection, as if a prophet had called unto it 'Shake thyself from the dust, arise—loose thyself from the bands of thy neck, oh daughter of Zion!' And who caused the revival? One man, Moses Mendelssohn, who may be considered the incarnation of his race (at the time)—stunted in form, awkward, timid, stuttering, ugly, and repulsive in appearance. But in this race deformity breathed a thoughtful spirit, which only when misled pursued chimeras, and lost its self-esteem only when proscribed. No sooner did it understand that it was the exponent of the truth than it dismissed its visionary fancies, its spirit transfigured the body, and raised the bent form erect, the hateful characteristics disappeared, and the scornful nickname of 'Jew' was changed almost into a title of honor."

This analogy will bear the deepest and closest study. It is a magnificent illustration of the inherent greatness of the Jewish race; and its power to rise to any level as soon as the ban of persecution is removed.

Graetz gives a most comprehensive sketch of Mendelssohn, and his labors and what he accomplished, dwelling, naturally, at length upon his friendship and association, literary and otherwise, with Lessing, who honored him in his "Nathan the Wise." "As soon," he says, "as Lessing and Mendelssohn became acquainted they learned to respect and love each other. The latter admired in his Christian friend his ability and unconstraint, his courage, and perfect culture, his overflowing spirit, and the vigor which enabled him to bear a new world 'upon his broad shoulders,' and Lessing admired in Mendelssohn nobility of thought, a yearning for truth, and firmness of character, based upon a moral nature."

Chapter 9 is devoted to "The New Chassidism"; 10, to "The Measfim and the Judaeo-Christian Salon"; 11, to "The French Revolution, and the Emancipation of the Jews"; 12, to "The Jewish-French Synthedrion, and the Jewish Consistories"; 13, to "The Reaction and Teutoniania"; 14, to "Borne and Heine"; 15, to "Reform and Young Israel"; 16, to "Awakening of Independence and the Science of Judiasm"; 17, to "The Year 1840, and the Blood Accusation at Damascus"; 18, to "Events Preceding the Revolutions of February and March, 1848, and the Subsequent Social Advance of the Jews," and then the volume closes with "A Retrospect." In ending this retrospect, the historian, referring to the rejuvenescence of the Jewish race, says, truly: "The present age has given the lie to the assertion of the Jew-haters, who, at the close of the eighteenth and commencement of the nineteenth centuries, were numberless; that generation after generation must pass away before any improvement could be expected in the condition of the Jews." * * * Similies are but lame, and give no adequate representation of a phenomenon to which there is no equal in every-day life. In any case, the Jewish nation is an extraordinary phenomenon, dating, as it does, from hoary antiquity, but possessing youthful vigor, having passed through numberless vicissitudes; yet, ever remaining true to itself." Graetz's history is a grand vindication of the Jews among the nations, and the gathering together of the riches of many mines of information, not accessible to the general reader. No leading event or character in Jewish history remains untouched by the author. He criticises boldly and fearlessly, but conscientiously, whether he is dealing with the Jewish or with other nations; yet, on the simple facts, his work is a great monument to the achievements, the virtues, the intellect, and the noblest traits of the former.

Graetz is not an apologist for the Jews; neither is he their champion. He is their historian, and on impartial history they can well afford to rest their case. No Jew can read his work without experiencing a thrill of pride. No Christian, no matter how high his estimate of the Jewish people may be, can read it without having a more just appreciation of the Jewish character, and an enlarged view of what the Jews have been, are, and are destined to be, to the world's progress in all directions.

MRS. ROMNEY. By Rosa Nouchette Carey. Author of "But Men Must Work," "Not Like Other Girls," "Sir Godfrey's Granddaughters," Etc. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company. 1895. Price, 50 cents.

English Conquest at the Northwest.

(Written for the Dispatch.)

CONQUEST OF THE COUNTRY NORTHWEST OF THE RIVER OHIO, 1778-1783; and LIFE OF GENERAL GEORGE ROGERS CLARK. In two Volumes. By William Haydon English, President of the Indiana Historical Society. Published by Bowen-Merrill Company; Indianapolis, Ind., and Kansas City, Mo., 1896.

A life, full of patriotic services finds a fit termination in the two splendid volumes lying before me—a Christmas-gift from the author. While the newspapers were ringing with beautiful comments upon his noble literary achievements, William Hayden English—lawyer, statesman, banker, and scholar—passed away from earth at his home, in Indiana. He had served as Speaker of the House of Representatives of Indiana; as Democratic congressman, from 1853 to 1861, and is well remembered as the Democratic candidate for Vice-President on the ticket with General Hancock in 1880. An interesting character throughout life, it is as the author of this great work, whose title is above, that he becomes especially interesting to Virginians.

The author, born and brought up on the borders of Clark's grant, of a family which furnished Clark three officers in his campaigns against the British posts, Kaskaskia and Vincennes, naturally felt an interest in those great events, which were so intimately connected with the history of Indiana, and added an empire to the boundaries of the United States. This interest, beginning in early life, never abated, but finally assumed the form of collecting all available information in relation to the occurrences themselves, and the lives of the men who participated in them, and found consummation at length in the present extended publication, whose successful debut into the world he lived just long enough to witness.

While it is impossible to enter fully into the merits of the work of Mr. English in a newspaper article, the following account may serve to give the public some idea of its general and leading character: He begins with a sketch of the ancestry of General Clark, which is traditional back of his grandparents. Jonathan Clark, his grandfather, died in 1725, in King and Queen county, Va. John Clark, his father, moved to Albemarle county, where George Rogers Clark was born, November 19, 1752, two miles east of Charlottesville, in a plain house, which stood on a knoll, near to and overlooking the eastern bank of the Rivanna river. His birthplace is about one and a half miles north of Monticello, the home and burial-place of Mr. Jefferson. His early teacher was Donald Robertson, who, it is said, taught James Madison, afterwards President. But Clark did not persist in his scholastic studies like Madison, and acquired only a common English education—not thorough, even, in some branches of that.

He soon determined to go West, and when only about 19 years old he crossed the mountains on an exploring and surveying expedition. The first journey was in 1771, and Clark's history from that time became identified with the frontier. In 1776 he and John Gabriel Jones were selected by the people of Kentucky to demand representation in the Virginia Legislature for Kentucky, and it was through Clark's urgent representations, aided by the sagacious policy of Virginia's first Governor, Patrick Henry, that the needs of the frontier were recognized, and an order for 500 pounds of gunpowder was obtained. This powder was of great use in the warfare with the Indians, which eternally raged on the frontier. But Clark was led to bolder and more extended designs. Early in 1777 Clark repelled the Indian attack in Harrodsburg, sent out spies to Illinois, and on their return hastened on foot to Virginia to lay before the Governor and council his plan for the conquest of the territory northwest of the Ohio. His scheme was approved by Governor Henry, and he was made a lieutenant-colonel, authorized to raise the necessary troops for an invasion.

Mr. English gives the fac-simile of a letter in his possession in the handwriting of George Mason, and signed jointly by Thomas Jefferson, George Mason, and George Wythe, pledging their influence to secure 300 acres of land for each of the soldiers embarking in the enterprise.

Mr. English has spared neither expense nor labor in locating the officers and men who figured in this remarkable expedition. While it was impossible to give the biography of every soldier, Mr. English shows that the claim advanced by George Bancroft that most of the troops were from Western Pennsylvania is thoroughly disproved by the most stubborn facts. All the officers, including Clark, are proved directly to have been Virginians, while it is shown that the jealousy between the Pennsylvanians and Virginians in the neighborhood of Fort Pitt, on account of the disputed boundary line, must have prevented any great enlistment of Pennsylvanians under a man holding a Virginia commission. In addition to this, the pay-roll of the men of Major Joseph Bowman, who was next in command to Clark, has a column indicating the distance of each soldier from home which is so uniformly remote (averaging 1,200 miles) that Mr. English thinks it can only mean Virginia.

Certainly some of the names are so essentially Virginians as to place this matter out of the pale of dispute. I refer to such names as McClannahan, Honaker, Chrisman, etc.

The Illinois campaign originated with Virginians; it was authorized, prosecuted, and entirely paid for by Virginia, and Congress afterwards recognized her services by reimbursing her for her expenses.

In speaking of the recruits, Clark says: "The officers only got such as had friends in Kentucky, or those induced by their own interest and desired to see the country." Kentucky was then a part of Virginia, and very largely occupied by Virginians from the East looking over the new country, and ready to enter into such an enterprise as Clark's."

I have not time to enter into the details of the capture of Kaskaskia and Vincennes. There were no great battles like Gettysburg and Blenheim. Clark's troops did not exceed 200. The British troops, without the French, who were in sympathy with Clark, were still less. But the distance, the uncertainty, the wilderness, and the Indians made the expedition one of terrible hardship, and the adroitness with which Clark proceeded in reconciling both the Indians and French inhabitants and surprising both posts, and the indomitable energy displayed by him and his soldiers in overcoming the rigors of winter and the terrors of rain and flood cannot but command admiration.

General George Rogers Clark is much of a hero in Mr. English's eyes, and deservedly so. In courage, in resolution, in real ability he has had few superiors. But there is no reason why we should shut our eyes to his failings. The young may be taught to emulate his good example, as well as to avoid his bad. Deception in times of war may be excused, but it is hardly at any time a thing to boast of. Now, that Clark was scrupulous with his words, can hardly be pretended, since he makes in his journal an open parade of his artifices to deceive his own soldiers, as well as the enemy. His letter in reply to Lieutenant-Colonel Hamilton, the British commander at Vincennes, is also lacking in dignity. It sounds small to address the commander of the opposing forces as mere "Mr."

Mr. English does not advert to these faults with condemnation, but he does say that, in after years, Clark's disposition was greatly soured. He excuses them by explaining how his just demands for advances made by him in the course of the war were neglected by Congress and Virginia. This produced disappointment, which brought on excessive indulgence in strong drink, provoking the utterance from time to time of bitter reproaches against his native State. It is evident that Clark was far from the ideal of a Washington, whose head could not be turned by success, of a Lee, whose noble majesty of mind could not be degraded by defeat or disappointment.

Clark, after his conquest of the Northwest, figured in many other interesting encounters with the Indians and English. One fact Mr. English brings out very interestingly—the constant peril of the frontiers, and the numbers of men it must have required of Virginia to protect the outlying settlements. The New Englanders, for instance, had nothing but the English to look after, while Virginia had another foe in the shape of the merciless savage. The fear of attack from this source neutralized the whole population west of the Alleghanies, and partially that west of the Blue Ridge, as a fighting force against the British, and produced a constant drain upon the people on this side of the mountains to keep them provided with powder and supplies. When to this is added the easy means afforded the enemy of approaching the heart of the State by the great rivers, compelling the expense of a navy which no other State had to keep up, it is easily seen that the sacrifices of Virginia with its scattered population, must have been immense; and yet she continued more troops in the Continental army, according to a recent statement of Dr. A. R. Spofford, the Librarian of Congress, than even Massachusetts with her compact population did during the two most trying years of the war—1778 and 1779.

Both volumes of Mr. English's work are copiously illustrated with portraits and stirring views. It it a valuable dictionary of Indiana history, and the original documents published by Mr. English furnish a valuable background to his narrative. Yet, after all, Mr. English has far from exhausted the subject of Clark's career. He seems to have been entirely ignorant of the three volumes of original matter in our State Library containing duplicates of nearly all the matter that he purchased at an expense of $10,000, and scores of documents besides equally as important. In these books he would have found the full muster of all the companions of Clark's Battalion, their payrolls, and scores of letters of Thomas Jefferson, of George Rogers Clark, of Major Joseph Bowman, Lieutenant-Colonel John Montgomery, and many others associated in the protection of the western frontier during the whole period of the Revolution. Virginia's history has only yet begun to be written. When all the material is collected, and when all is written, the story of the superb sacrifices of the State will surpass, it is fondly believed, the glorious record of any State, either in ancient or modern times. The Northwest Territory, with which the names of Clark and Henry are inseparably connected, doubled the area of the Union, and it was the first of those colossal additions made by Virginia to the Union, which, through them and their successors, Jefferson, Monroe, and Tyler, stretched the Empire of Republics from ocean to ocean and from the Lakes to the Gulf of Mexico.

LYON G. TYLER,
William and Mary College.

"Our Ship of Life."

(Written for the Dispatch.)

How gayly sails our ship of life
When all is fair and bright,
The sun of success around us shines,
No darkness is there, no night.
When over in the distance is the harbor
Of a cherished object in view,
And the gentle breezes of Hope are blowing
And the skies are clear and blue.

But oh! our ship is so helpless,
When 'gainst Adversity's rock she's run,
When the clouds of Failure are lowering,
And hiding from her the sun.
When she sees only the harbor
Of her shattered hopes in view,
And the waves of Disappointment are lashing
Furiously against her, too.

It is then that she needs her Saviour,
Speaking His "Peace be still,"
Calming the troubled waters,
By the force of His Father's will.
It is then that she needs to listen
To His voice above the storm,
"Be of good cheer, I'm with thee,
To thee there shall come no harm."

Oh! ship of life! so tempest-tossed,
What matter if the winds be high?
What matter if the sun doth hide his face
If thy Saviour He is nigh?
For with His hand to guide thee
Thou shalt be surely blest,
And the distant harbor of Heaven will be
To thee a haven of rest.

MOLLIE ROBERSON WILTSHIRE.